

From: Terry Simpson/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 2/9/2012 2:21:34 PM
To: "Richard Fetzer" <Fetzer.Richard@epamail.epa.gov>; "Rupert.Richard@epamail.epa.gov" <Rupert.Richard@epamail.epa.gov>; "KarenD Johnson" <Johnson.KarenD@epamail.epa.gov>
CC: "Cynthia Metzger" <Metzger.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov>; "Cynthia Caporale" <Caporale.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov>; "Fred Foreman" <Foreman.Fred@epamail.epa.gov>; "Mike Mahoney" <Mahoney.Mike@epamail.epa.gov>; "Jarmael Burman" <Burman.Jarmael@epamail.epa.gov>
Subject: Cabot Existing Home Well Data

[attachment "Cabot HW Data Checklists 06Feb2012.pdf" deleted by Richard Rupert/R3/USEPA/US]
[attachment "QA_QC Review of Cabot Home Well Data 06Feb2012.docx" deleted by Richard Rupert/R3/USEPA/US]
Rich / Rich / Karen,

Attached are two files comprising Ft. Meade's QA review of the existing home well data provided by Cabot Oil & Gas in its initial response to the 104e request. Cabot's response included a total of 16 files. Of those 16 files,

- one was the transmittal letter accompanying the 104e response,
- one was a PowerPoint presentation to PA DEP re: its 12/15/10 Consent Order and Settlement Agreement,
- five were analytical results/data pertaining to the home wells of interest,
- one was analytical results from a Duke University study,
- two were Cabot's response to allegations of releases impacting soil and surface water,
- five were investigations of other releases including a diesel spill and drilling mud,
- one was the laboratory data package associated with a Focused Site Assessment conducted by URS Corporation (date & purpose unknown).

Ft. Meade QA Staff focused its attention on the 5 files pertaining to the home wells of interest:

CABOT-EPA 000001 Brickhouse February 16 2010.pdf
CABOT-EPA 000008 Brickhouse February 16 2010 (2).pdf
CABOT-EPA 000020 Brickhouse February 17 2010.pdf
CABOT-EPA 000176 TestAmerica Results August 4 2011.pdf
CABOT-EPA 001621 TestAmerica Results September 1 2011.pdf.

The following is an outline of the procedure we followed for this exercise:

1. We developed two checklists in order to review each of the five home well files for analytical results and accompanying QA/QC data.
2. We then reviewed each analytical package for presence/absence of the appropriate QC data.
3. Upon discovery that two of the five analytical reports contained appropriate QA/QC data, we tasked our ESAT contractor to validate those results.
4. We, then, created a summary matrix of each of the analytical reports and identified to what extent each set of data may be used (i.e., limitations on use).

It is my understanding that the validation reports from the two TestAmerica results files have already been transmitted to you in a separate email.

If you have any questions regarding the attached documents or the procedure we employed, please contact me.

Terry

Terry Simpson, Regional QA Manager
US EPA Region 3
Environmental Science Center
701 Mapes Road
Ft. Meade, MD 20755-5350

Voice: 410.305.2739

Fax: 410.305.3095

email: simpson.terry@epa.gov

Region 3 QA Website:

<http://www.epa.gov/region03/esc/qa/index.htm>

Only four types of organizations need to worry about data quality:

- Those that care about their customers,

- Those that care about profit and loss,

- Those that care about their employees, and

- Those that care about their futures.

– Thomas C. Redman (2006)